

Digester Tankage * * * Manufactured By Darling & Company." The remainder of the article was labeled in part: "100 Pounds Darling's Hog Cents Digester Tankage * * * Manufactured By Darling & Company Union Stock Yards Chicago."

Examination of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it contained glass.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it contained an added deleterious ingredient, to wit, glass, which might render said article injurious to health.

On January 10, 1923, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11211. Misbranding of H. H. H. Liniment. U. S. v. Robert L. Gifford (William Gifford & Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. No. 12303. I. S. No. 7564-r.)

On November 30, 1920, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Robert L. Gifford, trading as William Gifford & Co., Chicago, Ill., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about November 15, 1918, from the State of Illinois into the State of Iowa, of a quantity of H. H. H. liniment which was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "The Celebrated H. H. H. Liniment * * * Man and Beast * * * Wm. Gifford & Co. Propt's Chicago."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of ammonia, camphor, sassafras oil, soap, alcohol, and water.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the information for the reason that certain statements regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the said article, borne on the bottle containing the article and in the accompanying circular, or on the bottle or accompanying circular, as the case might be, to wit, (bottle and circular) "For Rheumatism," "For * * * Neuralgia," "For * * * Diphtheria," "For * * * Sciatica," "For * * * Pleurisy," "For * * * Frost Bites, Burns * * * Headache * * * Toothache, Lamé Back * * * Corns," "For * * * Splent," (bottle) "For * * * Earache," "For * * * Bites of Insects," "For Spavins," "For * * * Ringbone," "For * * * Sweeney," "For Colic or Bots," (circular) "For * * * Lameness," "For * * * Sore Throat," "Directions For Using H. H. H. Liniment * * * Quinsey * * * Sick Headache * * * Kidney Complaint And Lumbago * * * Catarrh * * * Swollen Tonsils," falsely and fraudulently represented the article to be effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for rheumatism, neuralgia, diphtheria, sciatica, pleurisy, frostbites, burns, headache, toothache, lame back, corns, earache, bites of insects, lameness, sore throat, quinsey, sick headache, kidney complaint and lumbago, catarrh, swollen tonsils, spavins, ringbone, splent, sweeney, and colic or bots, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On February 1, 1923, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11212. Misbranding of olive oil. U. S. v. Lawrence Greco (Greco Importing Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 13094. I. S. No. 11813-r.)

On November 30, 1920, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Lawrence Greco, trading as Greco Importing Co., Chicago, Ill., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about December 27, 1919, from the State of Illinois into the State of Wisconsin, of a consignment of olive oil which was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Termini Imerese Finest Quality Olive Oil Contents $\frac{1}{2}$ Gallon."

Examination of 16 cans of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the average volume was 0.44 gallon.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Contents $\frac{1}{2}$ Gallon," borne on the cans containing the article, regarding the said article, was false and misleading in that it